Fellowship

• • *May* 1948 • Vol. XIV—No. 5 • 20 cents a copy—$2.00 a year

Spring, 1948

The Pacifist Movement in Berlin, by Henry Holm

A Look Around, by A. J. Muste

Pacifists Should Vote Socialist, by Donald Harrington

A Word to the Conscientious, by Robert O. Blood, Jr.

War on the Picket Line, by Kenneth Ives

THIS MONTH

Donald Harrington, associate minister at Community Church in New York with John Haynes Holmes, thinks *Pacifists Should Vote Socialist,* and tells why he feels that way. . . . Bob Blood teaches sociology at William Penn College, and is the son of a former Governor of New Hampshire. . . . Henry Holm is the Berlin correspondent of Worldover Press. . . . A. J. Muste gives us some interesting and informal thoughts on various aspects of the world situation, doing just the kind of job we hoped he would do for his monthly column, (when he had it), but which he never did. . . . Kenneth Ives is ex-prison and ex-CPS, and is an official of the Industrial Workers of the World, which is still alive and maybe kicking, in case you didn't know.

NEXT MONTH

D. B. Hemmeon wonders whether Shakespeare was a pacifist, and examines the evidence in a bright, scholarly little dissertation. . . . Milton Mayer's turn comes round again, and FELLOWSHIP's readers will no doubt find another delightfully worded epistle—the kind that blows up in your face—such as only Mayer can produce. . . . W. E. Orchard, D.D., is the author of *The Temple,* A Book of Prayer, from which we take a short but very moving meditation. . . . The story of recent developments in the National FOR office in the way of a new and quietly revolutionary salary scale will appear.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the

Fellowship of Reconciliation

2929 Broadway
New York 25, N. Y.

A. J. MUSTE, *Secretary*

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE,
International Secretary

ALFRED HASSLER, *Editor*

CONSTANCE MUSTE,
Assistant Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Margueritte Harmon Bro
Allan Knight Chalmers
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Elisabeth D. Dodds
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Wallace Hamilton
Erna Harris
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Alfred D. Moore
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly except August. Re-entered as second class matter July 1, 1947, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879; additional entry at Lebanon, Pa.

20 Cents a Copy $2 a Year

Fellowship
the journal of the fellowship of reconciliation

May 1948 Vol. XIV—No. 5

A. J. MUSTE TAKES

A Look Around

A few days ago a group of pacifists was discussing the state of the universe. One of the foremost religious journalists in the country, after the inevitable recital by members of the group of appalling developments in various quarters, observed: "Have you noticed what a blessed silence has been coming out of India recently?" Then we began to remind ourselves that the communal strife to the abolition of which Gandhi gave the last weeks of his life seems largely to have abated. Furthermore, the Moslem, Hindu and Sikh politico-religious organizations which were so largely responsible for the communal strife have been radically altered and transformed into purely religious societies. Another development in India is that the more than 500 Princely States have in the first seven months of freedom virtually all been integrated in India (a few in Pakistan). Indeed in the Indian orbit only the important state of Hyderabad has not been integrated.

This is by no means to say that the millennium has arrived in India. The Kashmir dispute has not been settled, though even there prospects have brightened. It is saddening to learn from John Haynes Holmes that India is contemplating the establishment of compulsory military training. Nevertheless, compared with the noise and deterioration nearly everywhere in the world, a blessed—and significant—silence comes out of India. Gandhi lives.

What Brains Are For

A news item which I picked up in the Kansas City *Star* on my recent midwestern trip suggested what the world, and the United States not least, needs at the present time. It was an AP dispatch from Washington and began by

saying, "The government is trying to get Americans to use their brains to keep from blowing them out." Part of the headline read: "Any weapon found to be still loaded will be made harmless and returned." I began to wonder whether John Swomley might really have succeeded in winning over the Administration and the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees to unilateral disarmament.

Tragic Reminders

As I read on I learned that the denaturing was to be performed on guns, bombs and other kinds of trophies which had been brought back from the wars and were blowing up in the faces of children with alarming frequency. That was a bit of a letdown, but I was cheered considerably by an absolutely brilliant observation a little further on. After stating that if the trophy you sent in could be unloaded and rendered harmless, the Army or Navy would send it back to you, the dispatch warned: "Don't take a chance even with trophies of World War I or the Civil War. Shells used in both wars are still blowing up."

How true that is, even of the Civil War, as A. Philip Randolph's recent courageous announcement of the determination of many Negroes to practice civil disobedience against jim crow in the draft or UMT, reminds us.

In the broad realm of international relations, alas, the government is pursuing the opposite policy from that relating to trophies of past war. In the former it is "trying to get Americans to use their brains to blow them out." The proposal to add from three to eight billion dollars to the "defense" budget, bringing it to half what it was at the war-peak, and the widespread determination to revive the draft if not to pass UMT are illustrations of the trend familiar to all.

The Target

The guns are, of course, not directly aimed at American brains. The bomb is to be dropped on Russia. But even as the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima proved to be the bomb that fell on America, so the bomb that is dropped on Moscow will be the bomb that falls on Atlanta, Wichita, Dallas, Los Angeles, all those places where they hate the Russians so.

It is the fact that the "enemy" is so well known and openly referred to that constitutes one of the ominous aspects of the situation. People in office and out on the day before Pearl Harbor were not yet talking about Germany and Japan as they now talk about Russia. George Sokolsky, the columnist, is in one sense not an important figure but what he says bluntly is also bluntly said on the streets and buses, in homes and factories, and is being uttered in diplomatic terms in the highest quarters: "We have come through the aftermath of the war, economically sounder than almost anyone anticipated. And that is what counts. The next war, like the last, will be an industrialists' war. Whoever can produce the means of destruction in the greatest quantities and of the most devastating quality will win in the end. Therefore, we need not fear—that is, if once we set our minds upon the target. Our target for a long time to come will be Soviet Russia. That is what, in simple terms, President Truman is trying to tell us."

There is another quarter in which there is no doubt that the target is Russia and Communism, or Stalinism, and because of the bearing of this on the Italian elections and other matters it is necessary to dwell on it. Cardinal Spellman gave the lead at that St. Patrick's Day dinner in the grand ballroom of New York's Astor Hotel at which President Truman also spoke after making his inflammatory speech to Congress in the morning. Said the Cardinal: "In this hour of dreadful, desperate need we are permitting Soviet Russia to continue her policy of persecution and slaughter, dooming our neighbor nations and ourselves to reap a rotted harvest of appeasement. Once again while Rome burns—"

What "Rome"

Oh, thou claimant to the title of sub-vicar to Christ on earth, what is meant by that word "Rome" in this context? Rome, the Holy Catholic Church? Rome, the seat of papal temporal power and Vatican political policy? Rome, the capital of the present Italian government? Rome, a pawn in the struggle of military forces? And in using here and in this historic moment this word of so many possible meanings and such subtle and deep emotional implications, wert thou observing the command of the Lowly One of Nazareth, "Let your yes be yes; your no, no; Whatsoever is more than these is of the devil?"

"Once again while Rome burns," said the Cardinal, "literally and symbolically, the world continues to fiddle. The strings on the fiddle are committees, conferences, conversations, appeasements . . . to the tune of no action today. . . . Fear must clutch your hearts as tightly as it grips my own, as we watch the towering glacier spread ceaselessly—as ruthless forces press ceaselessly to a finish the issues of slavery against democracy, evil against good, might against right, Stalinism against God. . . . I cannot believe the Italian people will choose Stalinism against God, Soviet Russia against America."

There is the line-up then: on one side Rome, America, right, democracy, good and God, and on the other, Russia, might, slavery, evil and Stalinism. The Cardinal left no doubt in his hearers' minds as to the means on which he relied to resolve this conflict. His climax was a declaration of faith in the military who "believe preparedness will prevent war" and an appeal for UMT, followed by a fervent prayer that men may "choose Thy side, O God—and peace."

Let me now hasten to add that you can hear essentially the same kind of thing from hundreds of Protestants and that I know many Roman Catholics who grieve as deeply over such utterances as I do. In fact, when it came to UMT so prominent a figure as Cardinal Dougherty openly championed the other side. I have simply pointed out an important factor in the interplay of forces, which gives us a good idea of the propaganda used by one side in the so-fateful Italian election.

Such reflections do not lead me, nor does reflection on the grievous shortcomings and evils of American policy, into the camp of the pro-Russians, or of those who think that the present Soviet regime or the Stalinists can or should be "appeased," or of those who think that organizational collaboration with Communists is possible, or that the "menace" of Russia and totalitarianism is exaggerated, and so on.

People who think that ultimately the safety of their children and the survival of western civilization and its values depend on military force are logical in being hard-boiled about it and in arming to the uttermost. It seems to me important that pacifists should be honest about that. Many of those silent boys in the Air Force who think that the United States must use atomic bombs first and get everything ready it can, are more clearheaded and realistic than softer-minded folk. I think they are dead wrong; but because they mistake the means, not because they mistake the gravity of the issues or the danger.

United Front Dangers

I do not see how as pacifists we can work organizationally with the Army or the southern racists or the Emergency Committee for UMT or many other groups and organizations. Neither do I see how we can collaborate with the Communists and Communist "fronts." You cannot serve God and Mammon. You cannot make peace and prepare for war at the same time. You cannot condone armies in Russia and damn them in the United States. You cannot be for conscription in Russia and against it at home, or vice-versa either. No amount of asseveration that the United States is waging war alters the fact that Russia is waging war also. Jesus did not deny that there is evil in the world and that in some real sense we have "enemies." After all, they crucified him. What he taught was that we must love them and so "overcome" them. The early Christians did not think that loving the Romans required them to serve in Caesar's army. Nor did that mean that they isolated themselves from the Romans, but they drew clear distinctions as to the various forms of association among human beings.

The events in Czechoslovakia have caused many who believed in "appeasement" in some form to change their minds, logically enough, in my opinion. Czechoslovakia was a democracy in the western sense. Its values were essentially western values. No one who was in that country as I was last August could have any doubt about how passionately its people wanted to be a "bridge" between Russia and the West, wanted desperately not to be swallowed up into the Russian or the American orbit, and certainly not the former. That they were swallowed up was partly our fault but that does not alter in the least the fact that the other part of the fault was Russia's. The Communists polled 38 percent of the vote in the last election and carried out their coup when they did partly, perhaps largely, because they were due to poll a smaller vote in the elections this spring. In any case, the idea that between a Russia and a United States fundamentally unreconciled there can be a "bridge" has been eliminated.

Masaryk and Wallace

The fate of Jan Masaryk is the symbol of the fate which awaits all who think collaboration is possible without a revolutionary change in the relations between the two great Powers, all who think things can be "patched up."

Since this brings Henry Wallace to mind, let me make just one brief contribution to the discussion about him in pacifist circles. As a pacifist, I cannot forget that he was a leading interventionist before

World War II and carried the torch for Roosevelt in the public discussions of that period. More prominently than any other Cabinet member he was involved in the production of the atomic bomb. I am unaware that he has ever given any indication that he is aware of the frightful material and spiritual evil he thus helped to visit upon mankind or that he has repented of that evil. Until he does so, I find it impossible to think of him as a leader of the peace movement.

War Next Week?

In spite of the fact that the situation is now such that an "incident" might precipitate full-scale war, I still, on the whole, question whether it will come in the next two years. Russia is certainly still weak and I doubt if its government desires large-scale war now. In the United States, although the faction which wants "preventive" war soon undoubtedly has grown stronger, some of the "scare" stories are related, in a degree impossible for the ordinary man to determine, to the desire to put over UMT and the draft and to the exigencies of the presidential election campaign.

The utterly tragic thing is that whether it is next week or next year or five or ten years from now, the policy of both the great Powers is war. If things should presently settle down somewhat, as they might, the policy will remain one of war. Two months from now it may be as necessary to warn against complacency as it is now to warn against the jitters.

Daily it becomes clearer that the world must now make the choice between war and totalitarianism on the one hand or the nonviolent revolution on the other; between Lenin and the A-bomb or Gandhi.

The Communists say that the problem of history can only be resolved and its goal achieved by violence. Americans and "Christians" protest that this is a monstrous doctrine; and then they speed up the production of atomic weapons. The Communists take over Czechoslovakia by direct and indirect violence; then the United States undertakes to see that the "right" triumphs in the Italian elections by sending warships into the Mediterranean and having Italian troops armed with American weapons in Rome. Thus they accept the Communist doctrine: violence is the final arbiter. But obviously you cannot overcome an evil if you yield to it and practice it yourself.

Communism, a faith, has to be overcome by another faith, the faith in love and nonviolence which is at the source of western civilization and which is represented also in Gandhiism. It is not an accident but part of the divine dispensation that the historic moment which saw the development of the atomic bomb—material violence to the nth degree—witnessed also the first large-scale social triumph of Gandhian nonviolence, that the age of Lenin is the age also of Gandhi. Herein lies mankind's hope and our call to action. And this is why the Chicago Conference reported elsewhere in this issue is significant and may also become an historic force, for the fate of mankind depends upon whether America is prepared to heed the call to be a redeemer-nation, not another "bitter empire," which as Holy Week has just reminded us Israel did not heed when Jesus sounded it two thousand years ago. It may well be that until some nation is thus prepared to risk its life for peace-waging God will not give the nations peace.

Do we 'love' the Russians only to fall into the equal temptation of hating the war-minded?

A Word to the Conscientious

By ROBERT O. BLOOD, JR.

In the time of Moses it was altogether too common for a man to hate his next-door neighbor. Grudges flared into deadly feuds and bickering was settled by the sword. Only within the family was there a sense of group loyalty.

Into this chaotic situation came Moses. Heroically he rallied the Jewish slaves and led them out of Egypt. And in the wilderness he said to them:

You must not cherish hate against your fellow countryman. . . . You must not avenge yourself, nor bear a grudge against your fellow citizens, but love your neighbor as yourself. *(Lev. 19:17-18)*

His commandment struck at the anarchism of the Jews, requiring them to get rid of their fratricidal hatred and grudges. Whatever malicious deeds their fellow citizens might commit, they had no right to retaliate.

Commandment Heeded

In the course of the centuries, this extraordinary commandment made its mark on the Hebrews. From it sprang a sense of national kinship under one God which issued in acts of mercy and generosity toward fellow Jews.

But that is where it ended. "You must not exact interest on a loan to a fellow Israelite," but "from a foreigner you may exact interest." *(Deut. 23:20)* Here was a double standard of morality running straight through the Mosaic Law. It sprang from the Hebrews' sense that God had separated them from other races *(Lev. 20:26)* and from it came freedom to blackmail, slay, and plunder "foreigners." Within the Jewish nation the law of love prevailed; outside it there was no law.

Jesus, from the midst of this Jewish community, saw that the law of Moses, which had once been a great step forward, was now a pernicious barrier to men. Once it had been an effort for the Jews to love their fellow countrymen, but now that the law had succeeded in its purpose, it had lost its imperiousness. Love of neighbor had become a habit. And since the neighbor also loved you, it had become pleasantly reciprocal.

Jesus broke through these boundaries with the mighty thrust: "Love your enemies." How absurd! How startling! The very success of Moses in building fellow-feeling among the Jews had accentuated their hatred of foreigners. Jesus was asking them to love the very people whom it was a religious duty to hate, including the Roman oppressors, Samaritan halfbreeds, and Phoenician rivals. These were the foreigners who differed from them racially, religiously, and politically. How strange that one should love *them!*

In our own day, the fascists are

the spiritual heirs of Moses' limitations. Gerald L. K. Smith and the millions of white-Protestant Americans who unconsciously accept his philosophy advocate and practice a vigorous patriotism. Their love for our country is undoubtedly genuine, but their hatred of all who are not members of their in-group is equally strong. Through the Ku Klux Klan they terrorize the Negro. Through the National Association of Manufacturers they vilify the "alien agitators." Through the American Legion they denounce the slackers and Reds. The strain of militant nationalism runs clear through the modern world, and our own country is no exception.

We Respond

In the midst of this world, so similar to that of Jesus, the command to love our enemies comes as starkly as it did to the disciples. We, the conscientious, could not fail to be sensitive to it. We have responded to the rallying cry.

We have overcome man's natural distrust and suspicion of the stranger. We have made the effort and succeeded in bridging the gap between us and the enemy. We have countered the program of the native fascists at every point.

When the Rotary Club turns down the membership application of our Negro friend, we are duly horrified. We write an indignant letter to the president, protesting the Club's unwillingness to be inclusive, and submit our resignation because we cannot conscientiously belong to any organization which excludes Negroes. And we feel good. We have done our duty. We have taken a clear stand on the side of the right. We have not compromised.

But going back to our action manual to find more instructions for our program of self-purification, we run across an odd passage that we hadn't noticed before. It says Jesus told this story to certain persons who were sure of their own goodness and looked down upon everyone else.

Shun Arrogance

Two men stood up in the meetinghouse to pray; one was a pacifist and the other a Legionnaire. The pacifist stood up and said this prayer: "Lord, I thank thee that I am not like other men, militaristic, prejudiced, or reactionary, like that Legionnaire. I send food parcels regularly to Germany and entertain Negroes for dinner in my home." But the Legionnaire would not even raise his eyes to heaven but said "O God, have mercy on me for my sins."

Are we in our conscientiousness the Pharisees of the modern world? Is it any more justifiable for us to cut ourselves off from fellowship with the Legionnaire than for him to cut himself off from the minorities he despises?

But how can we love these bigoted racists, arrogant nationalists, and rabid capitalists? And what will our labor friends think when they hear that we associate with big business? They'll accuse us of betraying the Cause. And won't we be? For isn't it precisely the smug circle of fellowship among the oppressors which cuts them off from the rest of society?

In our perplexity, the accusation suddenly acquires familiarity. Jesus, like the Pharisees, earnestly sought purity and holiness. But unlike theirs, his search was not

isolated. It necessarily involved unholy men. For no man can be pure unto himself, alone. So Jesus accepted the hospitality of greedy tax-collectors, and he, too, was labeled a compromiser.

Woolman's Way

John Woolman chose the same hard way that Jesus did. He could have spent his time turning out abolitionist literature in the North. He could have worked on the underground railroad aiding the fleeing slaves. But he responded to the wise counsel of Moses who after forbidding hate against one's fellow countryman went on to say that "what you must do is to warn him of his fault, lest you incur guilt yourself." *(Lev. 19:17)* Woolman sought out the Quaker slaveholders in their Southern mansions. In the long evenings, he "labored with them," pleading patiently and frankly for the freedom of the slaves, pleading in the way that was so painful to him.

Here was fellowship without compromise; for this fellowship made possible the effort to dissuade the oppressor from his evil ways. This was far more difficult than the Pharisaic isolation of most of us in our little mutual-admiration circle of liberals and discriminees.

But our sin is not simply that of isolationism. In our solidarity with the oppressed which has sprung from our loyalty to the love-your-enemies motif, we are made aware of their sufferings. When our Negro friends are refused service in restaurants, we too are hurt and anger rises within us, and we hate the head waiter.

Have we reached the goal of loving the enemies of white, Protestant America only to hate white, Protestant Americans? Have we been concerned about alcoholics, and hated the brewers? Do we love enemies and hate friends?

Here is the crux of our problem. Is Jesus responsible for our dilemma? Is this the inevitable result of loving enemies? Is it possible to remove the barricades from the streets or is our only choice that of crossing over to the proletarian side?

Our Own Enemies

But Jesus did not say "love society's enemies" or "love everybody else's enemies." What he said was love *your* enemies . . . the enemies you have created. Perhaps we should have paid more attention to the adjective!

Maybe it's harder for us to love our reactionary neighbor than a far-off Russian. In fact, I suspect that the inherited Christianity which enabled us to love society's enemies will not be enough to empower us to love *our* enemies. Only the pure love of God flooding our hearts will empower us to reach across this last great gulf and achieve fellowship with the oppressor as well as with the oppressed.

The discovery that we too have sinned in our Pharisaism of sophisticated hates will drive us to confess that we too have come short of the glory of God. Indeed the very fact that we are the conscientious makes our guilt the greater. No longer can we set ourselves apart from any man. And in this solidarity with sinner and sinned-against, we are called to the arduous task of being God's instruments in the conversion of the oppressors to the ways of love and mercy. This is the responsibility we have shirked too long.

Pacifists Should Vote Socialist

By DONALD HARRINGTON

The two political articles which appeared in the March issue of FELLOWSHIP assumed, correctly I hope, that pacifists will vote for the candidates of neither the Republican nor the Democratic Party in November, because both stand for get-tough, big-power-rivalry policies that must inevitably end in World War III.

But neither article offered a very promising alternative. Dwight Macdonald urged pacifists not to vote at all in '48, certainly not a very constructive proposal. And James Peck urged that pacifists, in the name of expediency, vote for the man who was Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and second in command of the country during World War II, and who is now, in the name of peace, the outstanding American champion of appeasement of expansionist Russia.

The Third Course

It is my contention that pacifists can support neither of these alternatives. The United States needs a President who stands and has stood for peace, who is opposed to the bankrupt, military-glorifying policies of the Democratic and Republican parties and the war- and slavery-breeding appeasement of the Communist-controlled Wallace movement. Fortunately it has such a man in Norman Thomas, who has fought devotedly throughout his lifetime for freedom and peace throughout the world. And it has a Party behind Mr. Thomas, the Socialist Party, USA, through which to express itself politically. I would argue that the Socialist Party is the only party with a peace platform for 1948, and that its candidates therefore deserve the wholehearted moral and financial support of all lovers of peace.

Mr. Peck's article was a most extraordinary document, weighing Thomas and the Socialist Party in the balance with Wallace and the Wallace Party and finding Wallace the more worthy of pacifist support. Is it so easy to forget Wallace's major role in World War II, his support of the Morgenthau Plan for punishment of Germany, his championing of "unconditional surrender," his ardent defense of Selective Service, (although now his position is anti-UMT), his complete and utter silence so far as conscientious objectors are concerned? Is it so easy to forget his scorn and contempt for the "namby-pamby pacifists" from whom he was so careful to separate himself in a speech in New York? Can we forget that address a year ago in which he stated clearly that if Russia should threaten "American" oil in Saudi Arabia America should fight, changing the expression afterwards to "would," but failing carefully to indicate whether he would support such a position?

Or can we, on the other hand, afford to forget the record of Norman Thomas in the generation-long struggle for peace—his years with the Fellowship of Reconciliation, his glorious fight to keep America out of World War II until the very day the die was cast, his

very critical support of World War II, his continual agitation for an Allied statement of war aims which would make possible a peace without victory and punishment, his cries for a halt to the war short of the bankrupt slogan of Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, yes and Wallace, of "unconditional surrender"? Can we forget his tireless labors for the rights of COs, his many visits to CPS camps in all parts of the land, his labors today for universal disarmament and the establishment of international institutions which would make war impossible? To weigh Wallace and Thomas in the pacifist balance and find it weighted on the Wallace side requires a most peculiar twist of thought which finds in the encouragement of Soviet expansionism and aggression the promise of peace.

Wallace Anti-War

Actually Henry Wallace is against war in general, as all right-thinking people are. But he offers no concrete program for peace except Soviet appeasement. He is for peace now for America, but condones and even defends the war-like, war-breeding, Soviet-Army-supported Communist coups by which Russia is gradually taking control of all European countries. He says, as James Peck indicates, that he is opposed to expansionism whether sponsored by Britain, Russia or the United States, but then reverses himself and describes the expanding Soviet influence and control as "the people on the march." It is not the tactic of war that he is opposed to, but American use of it in the power struggle.

Two of Peck's assertions are truly amazing: that the Wallace Party has Communist backing; and that the Wallace Party is more deserving of support because it has more in the way of "native roots" than the Socialists. The first is a miracle of understatement; the second is utterly ludicrous. The Wallace Party not only has Communist backing—it is at its core Communist-controlled. This outfit with so-called "native roots" is actually almost completely in the hands of people whose primary loyalty is to a foreign, totalitarian power. Let us look at its organizational components and personalities.

It consists of a committee called The National Wallace for President Committee, headed by two liberals, Elmer Benson and Angus Cameron, both known for their willingness to fellow-travel with the Communists. The Committee is actively supported by the Progressive Citizens of America, which was an amalgam of the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, two organizations with fellow-traveler reputations. The Progressive Citizens of America welcomes Communists, and therefore gets them. Communist strategy throughout the world today is to "work," and work with, liberals, using them as camouflage for ulterior purposes. Non-Communist liberals prefer to work through Americans for Democratic Action or the Socialist Party. Recently many of the most tolerant of the liberals in PCA, such as Dr. Frank Kingdon, withdrew because of their inability any further to stomach the complete Communist control.

Another organization supplying strength to the Wallace movement is the American Labor Party, purged of its last vestige of non-Communist influence. Its leader,

Vito Marcantonio, whose voting record in Congress follows most switches of the Communist Party line (and which record was described by Wallace as the best voting record in Congress), is as ruthless a politician as New York City has ever seen. His latest political step has been to tie up with the worst elements of the old gangster-ridden Tammany machine. Marcantonio is determined to use the entire New York State Wallace vote plus the corrupt Tammany vote to build his Communist-dominated, Tammany-allied American Labor Party. How many pacifists want to help that movement along, I wonder.

Finally, the Wallace organization has the official and enthusiastic support of the Communist Party itself. As William Z. Foster put it at a Communist meeting in Philadelphia on February 28: "With Wallace as our leader, the workingman will have a voice in American politics. . . . Bend all your efforts to build this new party."

More recently the National Board of the Communist Party openly published its opinion that many of Mr. Wallace's followers were now ripe for membership in the Communist Party and announced its intention of seeking party recruits from among his third party adherents. Thus the Wallace Party has now become a typical "transmission belt" for the Communist Party, and must be regarded as such.

Each morning's paper brings word of some new Communist taking leadership in Wallace's Party. The chairman of the movement in Iowa, Wallace's home state, is a former presidential elector of the Communist Party. At the rally in York, Pa., a few weeks ago, at which the Pennsylvania Progressive Party was organized, with Wallace present, the keynote speech was by Thomas Fitzpatrick, of the United Electrical Workers—CIO, said by *Counterattack* to be a Communist Party member. The newly announced director of youth and veterans activities, Seymour Linfield, has been an active member of the Young Communist League, according to the daily press.

Attacks Liberals

The Wallace organization is battling in Illinois and California such non-Communist liberals as Paul Douglas and Helen Gahagan Douglas; it has, so far as I know, the support of not one single non-Communist leader of labor. It is not only backed, but staffed, supported, controlled and held in the iron grip of the Communists and their fellow travelers!

This is what makes the Wallace Party dangerous. Functioning as a liberal camouflage for the Communists, it might conceivably bring the Communist Party to power in the United States in some future election, perhaps in 1952. It would have a real chance if the United States suffered a severe depression. It might happen much as in Czechoslovakia where, until recently, liberals worked along with Communists in a united front. The Communists lulled the liberals with sweet words and solemn promises while they quietly dug themselves into positions of power in the government and labor unions, and consolidated their strength in the police force and army. Then suddenly, before the liberals knew what was happening, they were no longer free. Too late Jan Masaryk

and Benes saw that they had functioned as the Communists' liberal camouflage.

Henry A. Wallace is rapidly becoming Stalin's American Benes, and it is a pitiful sight to behold—a man who pictures himself as liberalism's Gideon become its Judas. And the danger lies in the fact that sincere liberals and pacifists may follow him, as cattle follow the judas-goat into the slaughter-pens, into that appeasement of totalitarians that always ends in disillusionment, slavery and war. Pacifists should not be misled into voting for warriors who happen, from some ulterior motives of their own, to stand for peace just now, for a little while, and just for us. They should no more associate themselves with Henry Wallace and his Communists because they say they stand for peace than they should have associated themselves with Charles A. Lindbergh and the weird assortment of reactionaries and fascists with which he became involved in 1940. Lindbergh and Wallace, both honest liberals, made the mistake of joining up with the wrong crowd, with totalitarians who have used them shamefully to mislead a public longing for peace.

Vote Socialist

Fortunately there is an alternative in '48 to the Republicans, Democrats and Wallace. There will be a political party in the field which has always fought against the things that make for war—against military training, conscription, armaments races, balance-of-power politics, and a war-breeding capitalist-imperialist economy. There is a party that stands for democratically controlled economic planning in the United States and throughout the world and for the political steps that lead to peace. It is the only political party in America today with a genuine peace program—the Socialist Party, USA. Though not taking an absolute pacifist position, it has within its membership a larger percentage of pacifists, and probably a larger number, than any other political party. Pacifist Socialists may even be a majority of all Socialists. Its political program in the present crisis is:

1. Universal disarmament, under conditions of international inspection and control. No UMT.
2. Support of the European Recovery Program and its vast plan of aid for the democracies and socialist democracies of western Europe, without political strings.
3. The development of a western European federation and eventually of a democratic world government, based on a socialist program of democratically controlled economic planning with full maintenance of civil liberties.
4. The elimination of depressions and other war-producing phenomena through the achievement by democratic means of a socialist economy in America.
5. The creation of a Third Force, democratic-socialist coalition as a constructive alternative to the totalitarians of the left and of the right throughout the world.

It is my contention that the Socialist Party comes closer to preparing the way for the pacifist ideal than any other American party. It has the soundest program for peace. It is arousing itself today and moving forward to electoral victories in several states. It deserves the enthusiasm and the financial, moral, and membership support of every American pacifist during the coming campaign.

War on the Picket Line

By KENNETH IVES

Every time a wave of strikes occurs, we hear pleas for an end to "blind industrial warfare." Now that the union campaign for a "third round" of wage increases is under way, it is timely to investigate this problem of warfare in industry. If we are to feel the importance of eliminating warfare from industrial relations, we need to see more clearly its extent and effects. And if we are to evaluate adequately what contribution various proposals can make to "lasting" industrial peace, we must discover what are the immediate, and what the basic, causes of conflict and violence in industry.

Open and violent warfare between labor and management has been relatively rare, and on a small scale in this country (though well publicized), when compared either with the numbers and achievements of the labor movement, or with the international wars in which the country has engaged during the same period. Yet in many instances these violent conflicts involving labor have influenced the progress and tactics of the labor movement for many years.

Examples of industrial violence range from the South Chicago Memorial Day Massacre of 1937, when ten people were killed, back to the great railroad riots of 1877, in which over twenty were killed and more than $5 million worth of property was destroyed in the Pittsburgh area alone. Famous and significant also were the Haymarket riot of 1885 in Chicago, the Homestead battle in 1892, the Pullman strike of 1894, and the Western Federation of Miners' strike in Colorado in 1903. The unemployed riots under Communist leadership during the depression of the 1930's frequently hit the front pages. Of a different type, but in the same spirit of warfare, was the tactic of sabotage popularized by the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) between about 1912 and 1922, but later abandoned.

War Atmosphere

In these and similar examples, the parallel between industrial conflict and international warfare is close and clear. Arms and explosives, mercenaries, spies and the destruction of life and property have been used by both sides. Hatred, deceit and an exclusive group loyalty (similar to nationalistic patriotism) are in evidence.

These phenomena do not, however, exhaust the influence of militarism on industrial relations. In May 1946, a railroad strike was broken by President Truman's threat to conscript the men involved. A month later, he announced that the Navy would break the pending maritime strike. A utility strike in Virginia was

called off in March, 1946 when Governor Tuck drafted the 1,600 employees of the Virginia Electric Light and Power Company into the state militia. As a result of such events, many labor leaders opposed the extension of conscription beyond the war period for fear it would be used increasingly against labor.

In the railroad riots of 1877, the militia and, for the first time, the Army were called out in many cities. Nearly 20,000 armed men were on riot duty. Pitched battles were fought in Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Chicago, St. Louis and other cities. In the Pullman strike of 1894, 10,000 troops were used.

Forts and Militia

The construction of armories (forts) for the militia (or National Guard) was a result of the events of 1877. And following the Pullman strike, the regular army was increased to 50,000 men. As recently as 1935, a total of 22,000 men of the National Guard were called out on eighteen occasions for strike duty. Louis Mumford in his book *The Culture of Cities* likens the military, with their armories, arms and riot duty, to an army of occupation. This likeness is emphasized by the extreme rarity of cases in which the military are either strictly neutral, or (as in one or two instances) prolabor, out of the many times in which they have taken part in labor disputes.

The deliberate use of militarism by labor, in this country, has been confined largely to the Western Federation of Miners in its first ten years, 1894-1904, and to the insignificant efforts of the Trotzkyites to form union militia.

Another factor which injects the military spirit into industrial relations is the form and philosophy of industrial organization. In both, authority of those at the top is absolute, and insubordination is cause for discipline. The parallel of structure and spirit between industrial and military forms, and its influence on industrial relations, is also described in Mumford's book. While in the United States industrial dictatorship has generally been replaced by persuasion, backed by prestige and authority, a large element of the former is still operating. Real democracy in industry is rarely allowed.

Industrial conditions themselves are among the causes of the war spirit, both in industry and in international warfare. Thus the Preamble to Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles says in part: "Whereas conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled. . . ." If these conditions can produce unrest which threatens the peace of the world, how much more likely they must be to threaten the peace of the communities where such conditions of work exist!

These conditions can be classified under wages, hours, living conditions, unemployment, factory discipline, and the defeat of workers' constructive efforts to improve their lot.

Thirty years of legislative restriction on wages, and on other working conditions, led to the Peasants Revolt of 1381 in England. A major cause of the railroad riots of 1877 was a series of wage cuts, another being the withdrawal of a strike notice by the weak new trainmen's union. It is significant

that no riots occurred in Allegheny City, across from Pittsburgh, where the trainmen's union survived the shock of strike reversal.

The eight-hour-day campaign of the mid-1880's took on much of the spirit of a social war, and set the stage for the Haymarket bombing. Mass unemployment has led to bread riots in many depressions, and has provided followers for Communist, fascist and other war-minded social groups. The congestion and filth of many industrial centers also develops resentments —the gas-house neighborhood is often the "toughest."

Industrial Revolution

At the start of the Industrial Revolution, and in its extension to new areas, the imposition of factory discipline—regular hours, routine and monotonous work, and uniform speed—created a great deal of unrest and even rioting.

Bitterness is also aroused by the inadequacy or defeat of unions. The murders of mine foremen by miners in the anthracite coal fields up to 1876 varied inversely with the fortunes of the Miners Union. The bombing by the McNamara brothers resulted from the near defeat of the ironworkers' union, of which they were officials. And the garment trades of New York experienced almost incessant warfare until the unions achieved a dominant position in the industry.

While violence and arms are the most obvious instances of warfare in industry, they may, as in international affairs, be but the occasional and most obvious symptoms of the war spirit, and the extension of lesser but more frequent skirmishes. In World War II, the use of other weapons and tactics was emphasized by the Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Bureau of Psychological Warfare (elsewhere called the Ministry of Propaganda), and the spy and sabotage department, Office of Strategic Services (OSS).

Similarly in industrial conflict, economic, psychological and secret-service campaigns are often used by both sides. Thus management employs the lockout, individual firings, or promises of individual promotions as economic weapons. The threat of these, and management's usual control over the press and even the pulpit, through advertising and contributions, are psychological weapons. The employment of spies and company police is a large industry in itself.

On labor's side the strike, slowdown and boycott come under the definition of economic weapons. The labor press and most union publicity campaigns are psychological weapons, with spying and sabotage as the secret-service techniques.

How widespread and significant are these techniques in our economy? Statistics on the number killed and injured in industrial disputes, or on the number of man-days of strike duty put in by police and other armed forces, are not readily available. For example, during the great steel strike of 1919, when 350,000 men were on strike for four months, there were 25,000 deputies under arms in the Monongahela Valley area alone, and eighteen people were killed. Spies and mercenaries employed by management from "detective" agencies totalled about 40,000. Formerly there were also the "coal and iron police" employed by companies in those industries.

On strikes, however, accurate statistics have been kept for the

last several decades. The proportion of workers taking part reached its peak in the two postwar years of 1919 and 1946. In those years, respectively, 20 percent and 12 percent of workers were involved. In 1930 a low of one percent was reached, and from 1930-1944 an average of 4.5 percent of the workers were on strike at some time during each year.

Since 1927, the amount of time lost in strikes has also been recorded. The 1930-1944 average was one-fifth of one percent of the available working time—less than a day per year per man. The highest rate came in 1946, when it reached 1.43 percent of the working time, or not quite the equivalent of a week per man.

By way of comparison, in 1944 (possibly a high year) industrial accidents (which are largely preventable) resulted in a loss of four percent of working time, or twenty times as much as strikes usually cause, and twice the greatest strike loss of any year. The loss of working time and production caused by unemployment in some of the depression years reached 20 percent, which is ten times the greatest year's strike loss! And of the 50,000 wage disputes which came to the attention of the Department of Labor in 1946, only one-tenth resulted in strikes!

Why the Furore?

Why then the furore that is made about strikes and violence in industrial relations in this country? Statistically, they seem to play a rather small part in the economy.

Certain additional statistics may provide us with a start toward an answer to this problem. In 1944 and 1946, there were about 5,000 strikes each year. In Detroit alone there were 264 in 1944, or almost one every working day. In 79 cities there were ten or more strikes each. Thus they are events which can be frequently read of in the papers, as happening near by. Sixteen of the 1944 strikes involved over 10,000 men, and in Detroit, the most active center, 360,000 workers took part during the year, or about half the working force.

Hard to Take

From the point of view of the industrialist, who is primarily concerned with production and with profit, a strike comes as an exasperating interruption of both. As for managers and foremen, accustomed from day to day to giving orders to people, and having them followed, the sudden absence or rebellion of followers upsets their routine, and their feeling of security. To them the problem is not primarily an economic one.

This rebellion against industrial discipline is no less complete from management's point of view if the strikers are completely peaceable. And it is no less challenging. Rebellion or insurrection may be the way the situation feels, to management. For historically, industrialists early copied much from military discipline, and many early (even some present) factories—and factory towns—were governed as absolute despotisms.

Then too, the numbers of those on strike at some times, compared to the number of industrialists and managers, may seem to these latter like an industrial army. Where a militaristic, feudal outlook prevails, this means that an army must be set up to oppose them, and to maintain "law and order" or dis-

cipline. There are many cases where martial law has been declared during peaceful strikes which seemed likely to succeed. In 1886, the *Chicago Times* argued that "hand grenades should be thrown among those who are striving to obtain higher wages."

While in this country few unions openly state that there is a class war going on, nor do many workers feel this to be true, it would seem that much of management has this feeling. Why should this be so?

In a number of cases, management has spent more money to defeat a strike than the first, and perhaps inflated, demands of the strikers would have cost it. Thus control seems to have been more important than profit or production. A succession of small demands, if won by labor, would produce a shift of strength, and hence of control. This, it seems, is what management fears and resists.

In addition to this question of control, the form and spirit of industrial organization, and the effects of industrial conditions on the workers, which have already been reviewed, there are a number of other basic causes of industrial warfare and conflict.

The Charles Wilsons

One of these is the division of society into classes, and the wide differences in property, income, security and leisure between the various groups. This is felt even where class lines are indistinct. The United Auto Workers publicized it dramatically a year or so ago, when it compared the incomes of several Charles Wilsons, all of whom worked for General Motors. One, the president of the company, received over $200 an hour. His nearest namesake received something over $2 an hour, and one or two received less than $1 an hour.

Another cause of strife is the employment of spies and of mercenaries. This likewise adds to the bitterness of the conflicts which ensue. While this has been done most often by management (and we must often count the FBI, police and Army as, in effect, mercenaries for management when they take part in industrial strife) union officials have also in some cases hired them. These "racketeers" or "goons" may have been first hired to protect union members from employers' thugs, but thereafter have often either gotten control of a union local, or been used by undemocratic officials to extort bribes from employers, and later to keep these officials in power in the union.

Control Again

This leads us back again to the question of control. For mercenaries are employed to continue the control in the hands of management, and control is desired for the superiorities in income and position which it can ensure.

The conflict over control, and the union's efforts to "usurp the functions of management," center around three areas. First is the division of the profits of industry. This is the factor of a company's ability to pay, sometimes brought into wage negotiations. The second area is that of the conditions of work—safety, convenience, and the type of supervision under which working time is spent. Thirdly, larger questions of industrial policy, such as where plants should be added or expanded, where and how to reduce operations when neces-

sary, seasonal and cyclical policies (annual models, price changes which make peak and depression conditions), are also brought into negotiations sometimes.

Labor Equally Affected

All these factors labor feels affect it as much as, often more than, they affect management. Therefore labor feels it should have at least an equal say in deciding them.

The problem of conflict in industrial relations seems, then, to be largely a conflict over control, and the various evidences of this control, such as the relative wages paid to workers as compared to what owners and managers receive. Perhaps, then, strikes are given so much attention and opposition because, to management, they are dramatic evidence of a loss of control over "their" workers. The first strike in a plant, and later, sudden strikes, may come as a profound shock to managers and foremen.

Such a shock does something, psychologically, to the people affected. The shift of control that labor's activity produces, while it may bring greater chance for personality development to the workers, means that personality changes are forced upon those currently in authority. Even if these changes are toward a healthier and happier personality for them too, students of psychiatry will know how rigidly and determinedly they are likely to be resisted. Such students will also have an idea of the lengths of argument (rationalization) to which those in authority will go in defending their stand. Rarely will the real motives, on either side, be accurately stated, or even admitted.

The roots of conflict in industry seem to be more psychological than economic, or even sociological. The economic aspects are the setting, the tools, and the symptoms to a greater extent, it appears, than they are the basic causes. "The employers' goal is to preserve an economic system of which they are the masters."

With these factors of control and of psychology in mind, the study of industrial conflict, and of proposals for eliminating it, should show greater perspective, understanding and realism.

For Further Reading

The Causes of War, Chapter II. World Conference for International Peace through Religion, 1932.

"Conflict and Cooperation in Industry," *Journal of Social Issues,* February 1946.

The FOR and the Labor Movement. Fellowship Publications. Free.

Call Out the Militia: A Survey of the Use of Troops in Strikes, by Walter Wilson and Albert Deutsch. American Civil Liberties Union pamphlet, 1938.

Dynamite! The Story of Class Violence in America, by Louis Adamic. 1931.

Struggling against the restrictions imposed by the nations which condemn Germans as warlike, is—

The Pacifist Movement in Berlin

By HENRY HOLM

Not long ago, an American officer addressed a small meeting of Germans and asked them to help in reeducating the Germans. As a free discussion was admitted, one German said:

"There were several pacifist associations in Germany before 1933: the German Peace Society, the League for the Rights of Men, the War Resisters' International German Branch, the Women's League for Peace and Freedom, and some more. They did what was in their power to warn the world that German rearmament would mean war, that Hitler would mean war. But nobody took us seriously. The world preferred to confide in men like Stresemann, whose insincerity we knew. When Hitler came to power, statesmen and princes would hurry to Berlin to shake hands with him, to sign treaties with him, the Pope being the one to win this race. We tried to warn the Germans not to occupy the demilitarized Rhineland, that it would provoke war. They occupied it and nothing happened, only that they laughed at us. We warned them not to attack Austria, as the world would never allow it. They attacked Austria and the world swallowed even this. What more could we do? The inevitable had to come, but we may plead not guilty now.

"We are only too willing to tackle the reeducation work, but not one of these pacifist organizations has been licensed as yet by the Allied Control Commission. We have a proverb in German, that everybody should sweep before his own door. We know that much cleaning has to be done in Germany, but the Allies should let us have the broom to do it."

To this the American officer replied that it at least indicated progress that a German was allowed to speak in such terms to an officer of an Occupation Army. Indeed! And if progress goes on at this pace, the next generation, should it survive, may get to the real job of reeducation!

The city of Berlin is living—if that is the right expression—under four Occupying Powers which are already on pretty bad terms with one another, which makes things extremely difficult for the Germans.

To get a license, an organization has to hand in an application, its statutes and its program. You think that is only three sheets of paper? It is 96. You must have sixteen copies of each of the three in German, eight in English, four in French and four in Russian. Seven Germans, living in the four sectors of Berlin, have to sign. When we were two years younger and without experience, we thought that prominent people would be the best to push this through. But a prominent man who was agreeable to the Russians would be rejected by the Ameri-

cans, and one who was satisfactory to the Americans, the Russians would disapprove. So we failed. Now we are out for mediocrities. We will try it with people with a clean record but who are absolutely unknown.

The League for the Rights of Men has already spent nearly nine thousand marks on translations and so on. For some time the pacifist organizations have agreed that, should one of them be lucky, the others would discontinue and join it.

"I Appeal to You"

I now appeal to public opinion abroad. We do not ask for money nor for food this time; we ask only for the permission to extinguish German militarism. Is it too much?

But I will tell you a secret. I, for one, have long since begun to make propaganda against militarism, and so have others. We cannot afford to wait and to respect all restrictions: there would be too much risk in it. Because, should a new war come, it is here in Berlin, where two hostile armies are at close range, that it would start. We should have the honor to see the beginning, but not live to see the end.

In the British sector, a meeting of more than five Germans is illegal. The Russians, more liberal in this, admit up to twenty-one. As for the Americans and French, I never asked. I am not interested in knowing, because, to say the truth, we are nearly always too many anyhow. What can happen? The military police of one of the powers might rush in, I might be led into the presence of a constable or even an officer, who would rebuke me for having done what was not allowed. I am resolved to take that risk. It is less than the risk of a new war. I would take heed of what he had to say—and try to be more cautious next time!

To make it a little more difficult for the MP, I do not write this under my real name. But, should they ever find me out, I will plead guilty and confess to be a sinner. Just because I should like to know how they would punish, under the present circumstances, a German for making propaganda against militarism.

". . . Some of us think when we have power, we shall revenge ourselves on the white man who has had power, and because our desire is corrupt, we are corrupted, and the power has no heart in it. . . . He stood as though testing his exposition. Yes, that is right about power, he said. But there is only one thing that has power completely, and that is love. Because when a man loves, he seeks no power, and therefore he has power. I see only one hope for our country, and that is when white men and black men, desiring neither power nor money, but desiring only the good of their country, come together and work for it. He was grave and silent, and then he said sombrely, I have one great fear in my heart, that one day when they are turned to loving, they will find we are turned to hating."

—From Alan Paton's *Cry, the Beloved Country.*
By permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

News from the Peace Front

Randolph and Reynolds Foresee Non-Violence vs. Jimcrow Draft

In his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 31, A. Philip Randolph, President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and National Treasurer of the Committee Against Jimcrow in Military Service, declared that if a jimcrow draft is passed the result may be mass civil disobedience among Negroes. He himself, he said, would call upon Negroes to refuse to register or be drafted, and declared that "Negro leaders . . . would feel derelict in their duty if they did not support such a justified civil disobedience movement." He declared that he would also call upon white youths to refuse to register for induction into a jimcrow army.

Mr. Randolph's blunt and unequivocal statement caused Senator Wayne Morse, a member of the committee, to suggest that this would be treason. Mr. Randolph acknowledged that it could be looked at that way, but said Negroes would be willing to go to jail and to suffer from terrorism if that was the price they had to pay to get their democratic rights. When Morse pressed him to say what Negroes would do if this country were attacked or forced into war, Randolph replied slowly, "The Government now has time to change its program on segregation and discrimination."

Following Mr. Randolph, Grant Reynolds, New York State Commissioner of Correction and National Chairman of the Committee Against Jimcrow in Military Service and Training, testified that he agreed entirely with Mr. Randolph, including his program of civil disobedience. He also reiterated a position he had previously taken by saying: "I personally will not reenter a jimcrow Army if the age categories of any draft should include me." Mr. Reynolds was an Army chaplain in World War II, and delivered an impassioned statement against segregation.

Iglehart Says UMT Militarized Japan

Dr. Charles Iglehart, Chairman of the FOR, Professor at Union Theological Seminary, and a missionary in Japan for 32 years, on March 29 told the Senate Armed Services Committee that UMT had been the chief factor in making Japan a military state. He described the gradual control of the military over labor, industry, science, newspapers and the Japanese Diet, and said that "Loyalty to the nation was in effect loyalty to the military authorities." He claimed that the process by which Japan was militarized was similar to the course we are now following, and said that "The people followed along reluctantly, seeing no other choice in times that they were told were full of crisis and danger."

Tax Refusers Numbers Growing

The tax refusal question continues to be an important one, and an increasing number of FOR people and other pacifists are becoming concerned about it.

Marion Coddington, until recently A. J. Muste's secretary, has refused to pay any further income taxes as of January, 1948. She announced her intention of doing so before the FOR Council Meeting in November, and the Taxation Committee which had been set up as a result of the Annual Conference last year discussed the position of the FOR in withholding from an employee conscientiously unable to pay taxes. The Council, when it met, was unable to come to a decision, and referred the matter back to the Tax Committee.

Subsequently the Committee suggested a compromise plan by which salaries of those employes who wished it could be paid without withholding, but without making the FOR as an organization liable to prosecution for failure to obey the tax laws.

Marion Coddington has now left the staff, partly for personal reasons, and had not definitely decided whether, if such a plan were inaugurated, she would feel she could work under it. There are others on the staff who are seriously considering tax refusal, and may be led to that position.

Some feel that, as an organization of people who believe in freedom of conscience, the FOR should unhesitatingly refuse to coerce an employe by withholding against his or her will. Others feel that the organization and those of its officers who do not believe in tax refusal should not be forced to break the law.

At the Chicago Conference of April 2-4, as reported elsewhere herein, 26 people indicated their intention to refuse taxes from now on, and 35 more took the same position but are at present having their taxes withheld.

The Executive Committee of the FOR on March 19 issued a resolution declaring its willingness to support tax refusers, as the FOR during the war supported all conscientious objectors, wherever they might take their stand.

Indian Problems

At a two-day conference in Tucson, Arizona, representatives of seven Indian tribes discussed the problems of health, education, and economic and legal status they face. Sponsored by the Tucson FOR and the Tucson Meeting of the Society of Friends, it was the first conference in the history of Arizona at which all the speakers were members of the Indian tribes.

Pointing out the terrible health conditions, poor educational facilities, and the fact that on some reservations half the children born must leave because there is not enough room, the group probed deeply into its problems.

FOR Field Secretaries

Midwest: Albert Watson, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 1406 East 40th Street, Seattle 5, Wash.; *Far West:* Orval Etter, 1941 Oregon Street, Berkeley 3, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, Room 310, 127 S. Broadway, Los Angeles 12, Cal.

Atomic Scientists Will Discuss Conscience

On June 5-6 at Haverford College a conference of scientists will be held, at which will be discussed the various issues of conscience which confront them in these times. Victor Paschkis, a Friend and member of the FOR, has been largely responsible for it, and the response from younger men has been good. Of the better-known men, Dr. Eugene Rabinowitch of the University of Illinois and Dr. Norbert Wiener of MIT will attend. FOR people who are in the scientific field and who are interested, or who know of other scientists who might be interested, should write to A. J. Muste for further information.

Journey Members Get 30 Days

On March 17, in Orange County (N. C.) Superior Court, Judge Chester A. Morris upheld the 30-day sentences of Joe Felmet and Igal Roodenko and increased the sentences of Andrew Johnson and Bayard Rustin to 30 days as well. All four of the cases are being appealed to the State Supreme Court.

The prosecution introduced as evidence a mimeographed memorandum which had been prepared prior to the Journey discussing the project and its purposes, and, to quote the local paper, "threw a bombshell into the defense ranks."

The jurors were all white, as was also true when the case was first tried in a lower court in Chapel Hill.

Literature Parcels Meet Urgent Need

The Literature Gift Parcels Program of the FOR has met with an excellent response, and has grown steadily since last September, when it was initiated. Parcels have gone to recipients in 23 countries of Europe, Asia and Latin America, with by far the greatest number going to Germany, where the desire for literature has amounted to hunger.

Requests from abroad have flowed in at an unexpected rate, and the $1,000 set aside by the IFOR for this project has been used up in purchasing literature (some of it in Europe) and in mailing costs. Additional contributions for the continuation of this work are being sought.

Many requests for books and magazines in specific fields have been received, and FOR members who have such publications which they would be willing to send are asked to get in touch with Grace Rhoads, Gift Literature Secretary, P. O. Box 90, Moorestown, New Jersey. The fields mentioned include: medicine, education, geography, biology, botany, psychology, social studies, philosophy, religion, business, painting, literature, peace problems, youth activities, women's activities, Esperanto, vegetarianism and philately.

For deeper thinking read: The Story of Eugene V. Debs, 5c; Swords Into Ploughshares, (Poems), 25c; Jewish Future (Analysis). Order from David Berkingoff, 315 East 209th Street, New York City 67.

Read "PLANNING FOR WORLD PEACE," an interesting booklet concerning us—all to take part in it. Send fifty cents for your copy. Address Emil C. Hasenauer, Hayes Center, Neb.

Italian Pacifist Refuses Military Service

Sandro Sarti, Italian pacifist living in Turin and a member of the FOR, has refused to register for military service. He was called on December 21 and wrote to the military authorities explaining his position and his refusal to register. To his surprise, he received a courteous reply which said that although there was no provision for CO exemption, he could be exempted temporarily as a student and former resistance member.

Sarti replied that he could not accept this, since his real objection was on conscientious grounds and he did not want favors, and was told that the case was being referred to a "superior authority" and in the meantime he had been given temporary deferment without requesting it.

When last word was received he was still at large, and attributes the mild treatment of his case to the fact that the government does not want to go on record as imprisoning a member of the resistance while so many fascist war criminals are being amnestied.

About the Ads

The editors decline advertising that is obviously unsuitable for the pages of Fellowship. However, years of being on the minority, or censorable, side of most burning issues have left them acutely unwilling to deny to other people the right to announce books, pamphlets, or ideas with whose literary or other merit the editors may be in disagreement. Readers will please understand, therefore, that advertisements carry the endorsement of the magazine only when the Fellowship name is included.

Summer Reading Check List

If you haven't found time to read these books, use the relaxed days of summer to catch up.

Not by Might

The pacifist answer to world anarchy

By A. J. MUSTE 2.50

Not as the World Giveth

Meditations by PHILIPPE VERNIER 1.50

Down in My Heart

Under the surface in CPS

By WILLIAM E. STAFFORD 1.00

Therefore Choose Life

Poems of EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 1.75

The Bomb that Fell on America

HERMANN HAGEDORN'S penetrating poem 1.25

Order from

FELLOWSHIP PUBLICATIONS

2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

Pocono Mountains for Eastern FOR Conference

The eastern section of the FOR Annual Conference will be held at Camp Beaverbrook, Pocono Pines, Pennsylvania, from Tuesday evening, August 24 through Sunday afternoon, August 29. Camp Beaverbrook is, and we quote, "surrounded by tall pines, on the shore of Lake Tamaque, with white sand beach, floats and diving towers. It is located in the picturesque Poconos . . . " and offers tennis, bowling, swimming, boating, archery, baseball, ping pong and all kinds of other things no one will have time to do, being busy, no doubt, with meetings.

Further information, and directions about making reservations, will be sent to all FOR members.

Roberts Calls Anti-UMT Forces "Communist"

The National Council Against Conscription recently charged Justice Owen J. Roberts with a deliberate attempt to smear opponents of UMT with the word "Communist." Justice Roberts, in the Senate hearings on the measure, said "It is my considered judgment that the organized core of opposition to UMT centers in the Communist Party."

The NCAC pointed out that the opposition has come from large church, farm, labor and educational groups which cannot conceivably be considered Communist in any way, and points out that in 1944 the Communists supported UMT, as the Justice is doing now.

The NCAC went on to say that "Sweeping and unreasonable statements accusing one's opponents of being Communist do damage to the process of democratic government, and make it impossible for good citizens to tell when a movement actually is Communist."

Freedom Train Protest

When the Freedom Train visited Palo Alto, California, in March, a group there organized and carried out very successfully a demonstration for amnesty for COs. With seven people participating, the group mingled with the crowd in the station and distributed 1,000 leaflets. One leafleteer was warned off the railroad property and continued to work the other side of the street, while the other six had no trouble whatever.

Members of the group also had letters printed in *The Palo Alto Times*, and a news story sent to the paper was printed in considerable detail.

Wallace Testifies

Testifying recently against UMT and the draft, Henry Wallace suggested raising an army of a million men through voluntary means. Told that Forrestal had only asked for 782,000 men, Wallace withdrew his figure as something he had "pulled out of the air."

LET'S HAVE A WORLD UNIVERSITY

Send for our free Introductory Plan which tells you how you can participate in this world wide peace movement. Join hands with people of good will across the sea who seek world citizenship training with a spiritual emphasis.

No obligation Write today

WORLD UNIVERSITY ROUNDTABLE

1257 S. Manhattan Pl.

Los Angeles 6, Calif.

Report of Chicago Conference on More Disciplined and Revolutionary Pacifism

Two hundred pacifists, two-thirds of them under thirty, came from all parts of the country by train, by bus, by car and by thumb, to a three-day conference in Chicago on April 2-4. They came to discuss "the deepening of the spiritual life and development of spiritual dynamic," and "a more revolutionary pacifist program and more revolutionary types of activity for its realization."

They decided that they must concentrate on the stimulation and coordination of a campaign to carry to the American people the challenge to renounce the war method unconditionally; to disarm unilaterally as an example to other nations and to break the vicious circle of fear; and to feed and rehabilitate other peoples, our "enemies" first as a gesture of reconciliation and good will. Individuals will be urged to embrace the pacifist faith and to refuse all participation in war, military training, and the production of war materials.

The Conference declared its opposition to war preparation, military conscription, tyranny and totalitarianism everywhere in the world, including the United States and Russia, and proposed resistance to them by non-violent means.

In response to an inquiry, forty-nine young men and women signed to give from six months to a year for training and work for peace on a subsistence basis.

Tax refusal in all its aspects was discussed at length, and 26 persons declared that they would refuse to pay all or part of their taxes from now on. Thirty-six more took the same stand, but at present their taxes are involuntarily withheld.

The imminent passage of conscription was considered, in the light of the latest word from Washington that a permanent draft would probably provide that every man, as soon as he registers, will be under military jurisdiction. Eighty-five of those present signified their decision to refuse to register under any draft or UMT law, and their intention to counsel those of draft age, who are inwardly prepared, to refuse to register.

No new organization was set up, great stress being put on the avoidance of organizational crystallization and on the need for a "grass roots" movement. At the local level emphasis will be on the cell or peace team which is committed to a program of meditation, study and action. The members of such cells would accept discipline in such matters as regular attendance, counselling with each other on personal and vocational problems, and economic sharing in various forms and degrees.

A Continuation Committee representative of different points of view, age groups and geographical areas was set up, including such people as Bayard Rustin, George Houser, David Dellinger, Francis Hall, Allan Hunter, Milton Mayer, Dwight Macdonald and A. J. Muste. This Committee will serve as a clearing house for local groups, organize the national campaign for complete rejection of war, provide literature, enlist the cooperation of existing organizations, and call further conferences.

Letters

That Man Wallace

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Peck admits that Wallace supported World War II and that he will undoubtedly support World War III, and resolves the question into whether Wallace is the less critical of the Soviet Union of the existing candidates, and whether he stands for a new economic policy that the author happens to believe in. Whether we like it or not, pacifists have many viewpoints on a just economic order, and no one viewpoint can be held up as representative of all pacifists. To take the question of pacifists voting for Wallace, and then deciding it on the basis as to who will be the man on horseback for a new political party is to shelve the original question.

On the other hand, Macdonald's answer of not voting at all is to fall into the other abyss. It assumes that whether a man is a pacifist is the sole question we must ask. What he should have said is that on the basis of pacifism there is no acceptable candidate. But we are still citizens of America, we still have other religious, economic, social, and political convictions. Because there does not happen to be a pacifist candidate is no ground for becoming a political hermit. We still have to make decisions, even in an imperfect world, and if we don't make them others with lesser motivations will.

TOM PENDELL,
San Diego, Calif.

. . . For Dwight Macdonald to label Henry A. Wallace as a "split and confused" personality in his crusade for peace (even though he may have helped shape policy for the creation of the atomic bomb) makes about as much sense as to label Alfred B. Nobel, of Nobel Peace Prize fame, a "split and confused" personality who, after having invented dynamite and guncotton and realizing the awful potentiality for destruction, had the courage to bequeath his fortune therefrom for the promotion of peace.

NAOMI E. LEFEVER,
Spring Grove, Pa.

. . . Dwight Macdonald's *bias* against Henry Wallace sticks out so definitely as to be painful. All that he succeeds in doing is to hurl charges and innuendoes. There may be good reasons why pacifists should not vote for Wallace, but to my mind, Macdonald does not present them.

C. F. AVEY,
Athol, Mass.

. . . What better way to see a man's character than when he has the *power* to work for the common man and fails so miserably as Wallace has since 1933? And yet Jim Peck has discovered this cornfed mystic from Iowa as the messiah for the pacifist. Peck fails to realize that Communists only support causes for ulterior motives. Will Wallace be for peace if the line changes? Remember the Communists were "pacifists" in 1939-1941.

NORMAN TUBIASH,
Roxbury, Mass.

. . . I think it is a great mistake for the pacifists to expect to be able to vote for a man on any important issue whose record over the years meets with their entire ap-

proval. . . . No doubt Wallace himself does not wholly approve his record in retrospect. Wallace is the only leader who is presenting *at this time and through this campaign a cleancut issue* on whether there will be peace or war, the temporary preservation of all that we have in this civilization or its immediate devastating destruction.

REX S. ROUDEBUSH,
Tacoma, Wash.

. . . The most tremendous issue before the American people at present is the question of Universal Military Training. Presuming that no bill will pass before elections, it seems to me that the man for pacifists to support is the man who opposes UMT—hoping that there will be such a nominee. If there is no satisfactory nominee, pacifists must vote for the least military man available. We cannot play the ostrich. We must use our influence for the most peacelike candidate.

Henry Wallace may be that candidate; or it may be Robert Taft—or some other. Let's wait until after the conventions before we make up our minds.

EDWARD D. HAMNER,
Livingston, Tenn.

. . . Like it or not—and I don't—Wallace is the one and only antiwar leader we have of any national consequence. He alone definitely stands against war, for he alone opposes the policy leading to war —meddling against Russia in Euro-Asia through the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. Whatever his past or future, and however phony his premises, he is at least clearcut and forthright on halting the Truman-Marshall march to catastrophe. Hence the only clearcut and forthright vote against war is a vote for Wallace. . . .

WILBUR BURTON,
Winchester, Ind.

. . . What can we do to promote peace? That is the question which you hear on every side today. I would answer—one thing we can do is vote for Henry Wallace who is working for peace. In the FELLOWSHIP debate I take the side of James Peck.

MARION LOUISE BLISS,
Wasta, Iowa

. . . Mr. Wallace is quoted as supporting an American Oil Imperialism. I first saw this quotation in a release put out by the Young Peoples Socialist League. I challenged it then and I challenge it now. It seems clear that since "imperialism" is so generally accepted as a diplomatic cussword, Mr. Wallace would scarcely have used it if he was really supporting the policy referred to. Instead, I proposed to the YPSL that he was really speaking sarcastically and attacking the American policy in an ironical manner. The national secretary of the Socialist Party, Mr. Harry Fleischman, admitted this was probably the correct interpretation of Wallace's remarks.

JAMES B. FLEEK,
Oxford, Ohio

. . . Why not try to elect to the presidency a Christian who has a Christian platform. I believe such a man to be Claude A. Watson, the presidential nominee of the Prohibition party. I have read the planks of that party platform, and they sound like Christian planks to me.

MRS. KATE J. ALONSO,
Orlo Vista, Fla.

STREAMERS OF LIGHT

By HOWARD JOHN ZITKO

Introduction by Theodore Heline

Proposed solutions to the world crisis in the light of spiritual science. A translation of the Scriptures with uncommon versatility of Christian viewpoint. With a chapter on Christian pacifism setting forth unique and startling ideas on world defense. Excellent subject material for lecturers and study groups.

Price $4.00 Autographed

WORLD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1257 S. Manhattan Pl.
Los Angeles 6, Calif.

Tax Refusal?

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

It has been suggested that *non-payment* of that part of our income tax which goes toward war or the preparation of war can be justified only if we are completely consistent and refuse also to pay those smaller war taxes all along the line such as theatre, traveling, food, etc., and that we would finally have to isolate ourselves on an island. Then why not apply this same logic of absolute consistency to the *payment* of war taxes, which some pacifists assume they should do? If, as pacifists, we pay our taxes, even though we do not sanction war, *we are voluntarily paying our government's demands for war,* and, to be consistent, we should also pay our government's demands for war all along the line from manpower to grease. If, as pacifists, we intend to resist war, not merely object to it, let us refuse to support war in all the practical ways that are open to us.

VALERIE AND FRANCIS RIGGS,
Cambridge, Mass.

. . . Our friend Milton Mayer is reluctant to pay his Federal taxes because President Truman admitted that "79 percent of our expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 directly reflect the costs of war, the effects of war, and our efforts to prevent a future war: National Defense—International Affairs—Veterans' Benefits—Interest on the Public Debt—Tax Refunds." But Milton neglected the middle part of the quote so that he could almost make it look as though 80 cents of every Federal tax dollar was paying for bullets to kill people. May I belittle his statistic, with no intention, however, of removing the worry on our consciences . . . one cent for bullets is too many.

Of the $40 billion in that budget, only the $11 billion for national defense, plus very few other items, can be suspect. Does Milton wish to repeal the G. I. Bill? Repudiate the national debt and bring on complete economic chaos? Withdraw from all international activity? (grant you that it should take other forms) and *not* pay tax *refunds?* And is he unwilling to help on the other part of the budget, the 21 percent that goes to "social welfare—housing — education — research — agriculture — natural resources — transportation — finance — commerce — industry — labor — and general administration"?

We are sinners, all, unquestionably. But we still hold free elections, and we want the government to do these other things. I am unable to see wherein fiscal anarchy would contribute under the present circumstances. I paid mine. I will protest from jail when all other rostrums are closed to me. Brother Milton still gets around, I notice. So do I!

BYRON L. JOHNSON,
University of Denver

. . . If I refuse to render military service, I deprive the war system of my support, infinitesimal as that may be. If I refuse to pay taxes the government will nevertheless get for its war program the money I refused to pay, and more, provided I have any property it can lay hand on. Is there not a case for a Stayinner?

REV. C. L. CARHART,
Chevy Chase, Md.

. . . .Neither of the participants in your discussion of the tax problem has devoted sufficient attention to the possibility of working out a sane, balanced program of tax avoidance through which pacifists can register their protest against the militaristic policies of governments.

The plight of the worker-consumer-taxpayer is comparable to that of a mouse in a treadmill. The government gets him going and coming, withholding part of his earnings before he gets them, and then taking a sizable cut, through consumption

taxes, when he spends them. For this reason, withdrawal to the greatest possible degree from the earn-spend treadmill is the only sane course for pacifist and non-pacifist alike. The practical means whereby he can make such a withdrawal is a productive home on the land.

SELMA VON HADEN,
Vista, Calif.

More "To Do's"

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

My main purpose in writing this letter is to ask you to add one more suggestion to your list of thirty—"What to do till . . . "

My husband and I became pacifists in college, 1934-37. World War II not only intensified our convictions, it cleared away all false premises. We know we couldn't be pacifists were we not Christians, and we believe few can. For the way to peace is not, as most of you fully realize, just nonresistance, but the way of love.

My suggested "do" is threefold:

a. Be a radiant, active Christian pacifist,

b. Win others to Christ, the Prince of Peace,

c. Win Christians to active Christian pacifism in the Church.

ESTHER M. SMITH,
McMinnville, Ore.

Nudist Approves

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

A friend has shown me a copy of your excellent little mag and I am enclosing my check for a year's subscription.

I note your quote from the *Chicago Sun* regarding nudism being a cure for war because the soldier would not know friend from foe. May I add to this that he would not know whom to salute. What he would know is that all men are brothers without being labeled with the uniform of any country. The human body would be the totempole calling upon members of the clan to be friends.

This being an election year, I might suggest that we elect as president a general. As far as possible only generals should be elected to Congress. Civilian holdovers should forthwith be made generals with a presidential fiat. One more rule, even if it requires a constitutional amendment: These men must never meet without wearing their uniforms in strictly military manner.

The resulting saluting among themselves will take up all of their time so that they will not get around to plotting war, curtailing the liberties of the people or thinking up any more bad names for Joe Stalin, and perhaps the world could breathe more freely once more.

ALOIS S. KNAPP,
President,
American Sunbathing Association

China Missionary Answers

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Our February issue of FELLOWSHIP has only just come to hand, and I note the rather devastating reply to my *Letter From China*—devastating from the standpoint of those who accept Mr. Burton's statements and his judgment. It all comes down to a matter of whose judgment is best and whose information is most reliable.

During 1939-40-41 we lived and worked in a border area where I had more direct dealings with the Communists who were in control of one section of our field than I desired, for they obstructed our relief work, and completely stopped our religious activities in the section where they

set up their government. Mr. Burton admits that he has never been in any of the Communist areas. Perhaps then my testimony has as much value as his.

There is much truth in his statement, but it is an overstatement from beginning to end. Perhaps, as he says, taking China's millions as a whole, it is true that no party has a majority, for most of China's people are not politically conscious at all. The situation is further complicated by the fact that illiteracy is still very high. It is my conviction that among those who can read and write their own language and who are in some degree politically conscious, Chiang Kai-shek holds a clear majority.

I have never considered that Chiang Kai-shek's conversion to Christianity was an asset to our cause, and I hold no brief for his type of religion. For thirty-eight years, through two world wars, I have been a pacifist, and still continue to be one. As such, I find it impossible in my own mind to reconcile Christian discipleship with the military profession or with military service of any kind. However, I do not feel that pacifists have a right to question the integrity and sincere faith of those who are trying to follow Jesus, but differ from us in interpretation and understanding. On the basis of the evidence, I believe that according to his light, Chiang Kai-shek is a sincere Christian, whatever his mistakes and shortcomings may be, and that the same is true of his wife. Although I am completely in opposition to much in his policies and methods, and to those of his party, nevertheless I believe that he wants to go in the right direction, and that there is more hope of making some progress toward democracy under his leadership when and if the war ever ends than under any other leadership available. The people look to him as to no other person, and if his leadership were suddenly to be brought to an end, undoubtedly chaos would follow.

In the higher ranks of government, there are some men of moral worth and integrity, working with Chiang, trying to save the situation. There are also plenty of the other kind. Chiang's greatest difficulty is the shortage of trustworthy personnel for the almost infinite number of official positions which have to be filled. If the Communists come to power, they will face the same problem; in fact, they are facing it now in the city farther south where we lived for so many years, and the results are not nice. Their underlings are a cruel, ruthless lot, and no more responsible morally than the Nationalists who came before them; in fact, they are very obviously less so. A man who is decent morally according to the testimony of his neighbors is more apt to come to grief under their administration than a ne'er-do-well. One who comes up for public trial does not even dare to claim to be morally guiltless of that with which he is charged because that is the surest way to total disaster. This is not hearsay. It is the testimony of a Christian pastor, twice imprisoned by them within the past year, known to me for twenty years. He told me the story with his own lips. Neither Mr. Burton nor anyone else can deny these facts as to Communist administration in the area in question for we have incontrovertible evidence.

Mr. Burton closes his article with the statement: "To support one intrinsic evil against another is not only intrinsically evil, but will be of no avail to overcome the evil that is opposed." That is well stated, but Mr. Burton seems to forget that it is a principle which works both ways. He very evidently does not intend to support communism; but as a matter of fact it seems to me that his article will give them much comfort and support whatever his intention, and will lead people at home who know nothing of the excesses of their regime to apologize for it, and to say "Perhaps it is best for China, although we in America want nothing of it."

CHINA MISSIONARY

This Summer for Service

A Directory of Constructive Projects for Study, Fellowship and Service

Adrian and Olivet Colleges

Student-in-Industry project in Detroit, June 11-August 27, with college credit. Seminars and field trips, cooperative sharing of living expenses according to costs and earnings.

Address: Prof. Clyde Onyett, Adrian College, Adrian, Michigan.

American Friends Service Committee

8 work camps from coast to coast, 3 community service projects, 2 peace caravans in California, 11 international voluntary service projects in European countries, June 15-September 15, 12 adult Institutes of International Relations, 8 High School Institutes of International Relations, 6 institutional service units in hospitals and reformatories, 11 international service seminars.

Address: AFSC, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

American Youth Hostels, Inc.

Hosteling trips in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Alaska, Central America, and Europe, 3 work camp projects, in France, Holland and Germany.

Address: AYH, Northfield, Massachusetts.

Camp Willowemoc

Interracial and non-denominational camp for children 5-15 years.

Address: Camp Willowemoc, 587 Riverside Drive, New York City 31.

FOR Interracial Workshops

Washington, D. C. and Los Angeles, California, in July.

Address: Racial-Industrial Dept., 2929 Broadway, New York City 25.

Home Missions Council of North America, Inc.

Summer service projects for students among agricultural migrant families in twenty-three states, for at least six weeks between June 1 and October 1.

Address: For Eastern Area, Miss Edith Lowry, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City 10; For Midwest, Rev. Ellis Marshburn, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago 2; For Western Area, Mrs. F. E. Shotwell, 330 West Adams Blvd., Los Angeles 16.

The Lisle Fellowship

2 international workshops in human re lations for college and graduate men an women from all over the world.

Address: DeWitt C. Baldwin, Lisle Fellowship, 20 West 40th Street, New York City 18.

Methodist Church

2 work camps, in rural Iowa and in New York City, for college students.

Address: Caxton Doggett, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City 11.

2 work camps for college students, in Cuba and Mexico.

Address: Harvey Brown, 810 Broadway, Nashville, Tennessee.

Northern Baptist Convention

6 summer service projects in this country for young people, June 28-August 8 and 2 summer service projects in Puerto Rico and France, July 1-September 1 plus travel time.

Address: Summer Service Projects Committee, 152 Madison Avenue, New York City 16.

Pendle Hill

Summer session, June 19-July 27, for mature students from college age up.

Address: The Secretary, Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pennsylvania.

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

10 work fellowships for older young people, and students-in-industry projects.

Address: Dept. of Young People's Work, Christian Education, 1105 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

School of Community Living

Summer work camp with manual labor, discussion and study in the field of the small community and the decentralist way of living, July 11 to 30.

Address: Ralph Templin, Box 125, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

For listing of service opportunities of 33 different organizations, including many not listed above, send 10c to Commission on Youth Service Projects, 203 N. Wabash, Chicago 1, Illinois, for the booklet *Invest Your Summer 1948.*

Spring Tonic — in Three New Pamphlet-Capsules

CRUMBLING BARRIERS

By CONSTANCE RUMBOUGH

Foreword by CHARLES S. JOHNSON

The moving, inspiring story of how determined good will can break down the highest barriers of prejudice and fear between races even in the South. Collected and edited from the actual experiences of Southern FOR members by the former secretary of the Fellowship in that region, and with a foreword by the President of Fisk University.

.40

BETWEEN TWO WORLDS

By RALPH TEMPLIN

The long-awaited story of the devoted pacifist missionaries in India who so identified themselves with the Indian people and their aspirations that they clashed with both the British Empire and their own fellow missionaries. The author has been a Methodist missionary for 15 years, principal of Muttra high school, director of the School of Living, and FOR National Council member. He is now professor of sociology at Wilmington (Ohio) College.

.15

In Apprehension How Like a God!

By BAYARD RUSTIN

The FOR's well-known race relations worker delivered the William Penn lecture in Philadelphia this Easter, and concerned himself with probing into the spiritual nature of the world's current crisis. A limited quantity of the lecture now available.

.25

FELLOWSHIP PUBLICATIONS

2929 Broadway
New York 25, N. Y.

Some Early Comments on—

The Church, The Gospel and War

Edited by RUFUS M. JONES

EDWIN McNEILL POTEAT "When the searching minds of philosophers, historians, theologians, dramatists, and other high level and concerned thinkers combine to restate for today the total case for pacifism, it ought to be the last word. They have felt a great urgency and have communicated it powerfully. It may be the last word in a way frightful to contemplate."

HAROLD A. BOSLEY "What a galaxy of writers is gathered together in these few pages! Rufus Jones, Charles Raven, Herbert Farmer, Roland Bainton, Kenneth Scott Latourette, Charles W. Iglehart and Kirby Page. Whoever thinks that Reinhold Niebuhr's position of militant non-pacifism is unchallenged as a result of movements in the contemporary world and church ought to read the contributions of Herbert Farmer and Percy Hartill. Whoever thinks the Catholic Church and her theologians are irrevocably committed to the idea of a just war should read the contribution by Edward Ingram Watkin. Pacifists and non-pacifists alike will be benefited by a careful study of this book."

NELS F. S. FERRE "This book presents such a life-and-death issue for the Church and for our whole civilization that it ought to be read and weighed by every responsible Christian and citizen."

BISHOP W. APPLETON LAWRENCE "Here's a book that dares to speak out plainly and unequivocally on the hottest issue of the day. There is no 'pulling of punches.' You know where the various authors stand as they interpret the eternal gospel in terms of the present day. They call for decision; they remind us that today as of old we must choose whom we will serve, for we 'cannot serve God and mammon.'"

$2.00

at your bookseller

HARPER & BROTHERS 49 E. 33rd Street New York 16, N. Y.